



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/489,310	01/21/2000	Gary Stephenson	7922	5677
27752	7590	12/07/2012	EXAMINER	
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY			ROBERTS, LEZAH	
Global Legal Department - IP			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Sycamore Building - 4th Floor				
299 East Sixth Street			1612	
CINCINNATI, OH 45202				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/07/2012		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

centraldocket.im@pg.com  
mayer.jk@pg.com

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**  
09/489,310

**Applicant(s)**  
STEPHENSON, GARY

**Examiner**  
LEZAH ROBERTS

**Art Unit**  
1612

**-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -**

THE REPLY FILED 20 November 2012 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

**NO NOTICE OF APPEAL FILED**

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection. No Notice of Appeal has been filed. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114 if this is a utility or plant application. Note that RCEs are not permitted in design applications. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action; or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

c)  A prior Advisory Action was mailed more than 3 months after the mailing date of the final rejection in response to a first after-final reply filed within 2 months of the mailing date of the final rejection. The current period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the prior Advisory Action or SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is earlier.

*Examiner Note:* If box 1 is checked, check either box (a), (b) or (c). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THIS ADVISORY ACTION IS THE FIRST RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S FIRST AFTER-FINAL REPLY WHICH WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. ONLY CHECK BOX (c) IN THE LIMITED SITUATION SET FORTH UNDER BOX (a). See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) or (c) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendments filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: *See Continuation Sheet.* (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): (a)  will not be entered, or (b)  will be entered, and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing the Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**STATUS OF CLAIMS**

14. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 23.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

/Lezah W Roberts/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1612

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant has proposed to amend claim 23 to recite the limitation that the pH is "3.3" to 3.5. This limitation of "3.3" was not previously considered in regard to the compositions of claim 23, and further analysis would be required to determine whether the pH range starting at "3.3" would have been obvious. Additionally a further search would also have to be made to determine the state of the art with regard to this issue.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In regard to Chang et al. only disclosing the antimicrobial properties of the disclosed beverage, the compositions of Chang et al. comprise the same components, a sodium hexametaphosphate; citric acid; and a sweetener, as the compositions of the instant claim. Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably conclude that these compositions would also treat dental erosion, with a high expectation of success, because the compositions of Chang et al. are substantially the same as the compositions of the instant claim and therefore should have substantially the same properties.

Further, the Board of Appeals states "The Appellant recognizes that the average consumer of an acidic beverage, e.g., a cola product, appreciates the need for enamel erosion control." Therefore the Board of Appeals concludes "it is reasonable to find that the average consumer of the acidic beverages of the prior art would also appreciate the need for enamel erosion control and thus be "in need of" enamel erosion control". See Decision page 7, paragraph 2. Based on the above recognition/appreciation, it would have been obvious to have been "directed" to drink the prior art beverages for that purpose.

Applicant's arguments that the newly amended claim is patentable over the prior art references are moot at this time due to non-entry of the proposed amendment.